

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 013 145

EA 016 711

TITLE District Practices Study. Phase III Summary Report.

INSTITUTION Advanced Technology, Inc., Reston, VA

SPONS AGENCY Department of Education, Washington, DC.

PUB DATE 30 Sep 83

CONTRACT 301-80-0933

NOTE Slip.: For related documents, see EA 016 730-740

PUB TYPE Legal Legislative Regulatory Materials (090) -- Reports - Research Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01-PC03 Plus Postage.

DESCRIPTORS *Administrative Policy; *Board of Education Policy; *Case Studies; Compensatory Education; Compliance (Legal); Educationally Disadvantaged; Educational Research; Elementary Secondary Education; Federal Legislation; *Federal Programs; Field Studies; National Surveys; *Program Implementation; Research Design; *Research Methodology; School District Autonomy

IDENTIFIERS *Education Consolidation Improvement Act Chapter 1

ABSTRACT

Following up on the first two phases (1976-82) of the "District Practices Study" of Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) as presented in a resource book and seven special reports, this report is devoted to the study's third and final phase. During phase III (1982-83), researchers visited 14 sites to describe their solutions to several types of problems faced by local school officials operating programs under Chapter 1 of the Education Consolidation and Improvement Act. In the report's introductory chapter, the authors provide background information relevant to phase III, including a discussion of phases I and II, the rationale and objectives of phase III, and a general overview of the phase III study effort. Chapter 2's focus on procedures used in promising Chapter 1 program management strategies includes attention to site selection, arranging site visits, and fieldworker training and debriefing. Chapter 3 seeks to establish an interpretive context for site visits by summarizing relevant findings from phases I and II, discussing legal requirements, and analyzing major themes emerging from the site visits. Finally, chapter 4 presents the promising practices already documented in phase III and discusses the authors' descriptive and documentary approaches to those practices.

1384

4

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

SUMMARY REPORT ON PHASE III OF THE DISTRICT PRACTICES STUDY

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
1200 K STREET, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20004
JANUARY 1995

X This report was prepared by the National Institute of Education in response to the request for information regarding the

study findings and their implications for the

education system. The study was conducted by the National Institute of Education in response to the request for information regarding the

ED0243245



ED 016 741



**Advanced
Technology**

PHASE III
SUMMARY REPORT

DISTRICT PRACTICES STUDY

CONTRACT NO. 300-80-0933

Submitted To

**PROGRAM EVALUATION SERVICE
DIVISION OF STATE AND LOCAL GRANTS
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION**

September 30, 1983

**ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY, INC.
12001 SUNRISE VALLEY DRIVE
RESTON, VIRGINIA 22091**

REPORTS FROM PHASES I AND II OF THE
DISTRICT PRACTICES STUDY

CURRENT TITLE I SCHOOL AND STUDENT
SELECTION PROCEDURES AND IMPLICATIONS
FOR IMPLEMENTING CHAPTER 1, ECIA

Michael J. Gaffney
and Daniel M. Schember

THE EFFECTS OF THE TITLE I SUPPLEMENT-
NO. SUPPLANT AND EXCESS COSTS PROVISIONS
ON PROGRAM DESIGN DECISIONS

Michael J. Gaffney
and Daniel M. Schember

THE INFLUENCE OF TITLE I BUDGET CUTS
ON LOCAL ALLOCATION DECISIONS: SOME
PATTERNS FROM PAST AND CURRENT PRACTICES

Richard Apling

NONPUBLIC SCHOOL STUDENTS IN TITLE I,
ESEA PROGRAMS: A QUESTION OF "EQUAL"
SERVICES

Richard Jung

PAPERWORK AND ADMINISTRATIVE BURDEN FOR
SCHOOL DISTRICTS UNDER TITLE I

Victor Rezmovic
and J. Ward Keesling

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND LOCAL PROGRAM
IMPLEMENTATION IN TITLE I, ESEA

Brenda J. Turnbull

TITLE I SERVICES TO STUDENTS ELIGIBLE
FOR ESL/BILINGUAL OR SPECIAL EDUCATION
PROGRAMS

Maryann McKay
and Joan Michie

LOCAL OPERATION OF TITLE I, ESEA
1976-1982: A RESOURCE BOOK

Staff

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
REPORTS FROM PHASES I AND II OF THE DISTRICT PRACTICES STUDY	ii
TABLE OF CONTENTS	iii
LIST OF EXHIBITS	iv
PREFACE	v
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION	1
BACKGROUND TO PHASE III OF THE DISTRICT PRACTICES STUDY	1
THE NEED FOR PHASE III	3
OVERVIEW OF PHASE III	4
CHAPTER 2: PHASE III PROCEDURES	7
SELECTION OF DISTRICTS FOR PHASE III SITE VISITS	7
PROCEDURES FOR INVITING PARTICIPATION AND ARRANGING SITE VISITS	9
FIELDWORKER TRAINING	13
SITE VISIT PLANS	15
CHAPTER 3: PHASE III FINDINGS AND THEMES	18
INTRODUCTION	18
INFORMATION NEEDS OF LOCAL CHAPTER 1 OFFICIALS IN A TIME OF TRANSITION	19
THE LEGAL REQUIREMENTS AND PHASE III FINDINGS SUMMARIZED FOR ADMINISTRATIVE AREAS DOCUMENTED IN PHASE III	21
PHASE III: MAJOR FINDINGS AND THEMES	27
CHAPTER 4: PHASE III PRODUCTS	34
PROMISING ADMINISTRATIVE PRACTICES DOCUMENTED IN PHASE III	34
DESCRIPTIONS OF PROMISING ADMINISTRATIVE PRACTICES	36
REFERENCES	38

LIST OF EXHIBITS

	<u>Page</u>
EXHIBIT 1: CHAPTER 1 ADMINISTRATIVE PROBLEMS EXPLORED IN PHASE III, BY AREA OF CONCERN	6
EXHIBIT 2: DOCUMENTS REQUESTED FROM PHASE III SITE VISIT DISTRICTS	11
EXHIBIT 3: PROMISING ADMINISTRATIVE PRACTICES DOCUMENTED IN PHASE III, BY DISTRICT AND AREA OF CONCERN	35

PREFACE

In 1980, the Department of Education [ED] contracted with Advanced Technology, Inc. to conduct a national study of school district practices since 1978 for operating programs under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act [ESEA]. This study, "A Description of District Practices since 1978 under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965," is commonly referred to as the District Practices Study.

One goal of this study was to describe how local districts operated projects funded by Title I, ESEA in the 1981-82 school year. A second, related goal was to document local educators' rationales for their program decisions, their perceptions of the problems and benefits of requirements contained in the 1978 Title I Amendments, and their assessments of the expected effects of Chapter 1 of the Education Consolidation and Improvement Act [ECIA] on school districts' operation of Title I projects. The study was designed specifically to draw cross-time comparisons with the findings of the Compensatory Education Study conducted by the National Institute of Education [NIE] and to provide baseline data for subsequent analyses of the administration of Chapter 1, ECIA.

During the planning year for this project (Phase I), relevant background materials were reviewed, an advisory panel was formed, the study's research questions were refined, districts were selected for the study's four samples, data collection

instruments were designed and approved, and a detailed analysis plan was prepared. A summary report in the form of a resource book and seven special reports (see p. ii) present the findings from the data collection and analysis phase of the study (Phase II). These reports synthesize data collected from a mail questionnaire sent to a nationally represented sample of more than 2,000 Title I Directors, structured interviews and document reviews in 100 Title I districts, and in-depth case studies in 40 purposively selected Title I districts.

During Phase III, the researchers visited 14 sites to describe their solutions to several types of problems faced by local school officials operating Chapter 1, ECIA programs. These technical assistance materials depict useful, locally developed strategies for serving nonpublic and secondary school students, designing inclass projects, and using teacher rating scales in combination with test score data for making student selection determinations. The full descriptions are presented in a separate document that consists of problem statements followed by descriptions of various promising solutions used in districts visited during Phase III. In addition to describing the solution itself in detail, the document provides contextual information about when the problem was first identified; how the solution was developed; problems that arose during implementation; and the response of parents, administrators, teachers, and students to the practice.

To meet the objectives of Phase III, a special project staff was assembled within Advanced Technology's Social Sciences

Division. That staff, housed in the Division's Program Evaluation Operations Center, designed the project, conducted the site visits, drafted and revised the descriptions of promising administrative practices, and prepared the final report.

The products of Phase III of the study reflect the efforts of many staff members, advisory panel members, and officials from the U.S. Department of Education. Consultants Michael Gaffney and Daniel Schember deserve special recognition for their assistance in designing site visit protocols and in advising project staff on the legal issues associated with the administrative areas documented in this and previous phases of the study. Both also made substantial contributions to the conduct of the site visits and to the preparation of the site visit write-ups.

The helpful suggestions of the study's Advisory Panel and the guidance provided by individuals in the Chapter 1 program office, especially William Lobosco and John DuPree, served to strengthen both study design and the final Phase III reports.

We wish also to express our appreciation to Eugene Tucker, the study's Project Officer during Phase III, for his support and guidance.

A final and very special mention of gratitude is extended to the Chapter 1 state coordinators, local administrators, instructional staff, and parents who rearranged their schedules, welcomed us to their states and districts, and cooperated in

other innumerable ways to help us gain insights into strategies for improving the delivery of program services to disadvantaged students.

Richard K. Jung,
Phase III Project Director

Anne H. Hastings,
Phase III Deputy Project
Director

STAFF OF THE DISTRICT PRACTICES STUDY.
PHASE III

ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY, INC.:

Project Management. Richard Jung, Project Director; Anne Hastings, Deputy Project Director

Site Visit Documenters. Richard Apling; Larry Beyna; Kimberly Cunningham; Anne Hastings; Richard Jung; J. Ward Keesling; Joan Michie.

Editing and Production. Kimberly Cunningham; Starla Pirinton; Maxine Rivers.

GAFFNEY, ANSPACH, SCHEMBER, KLIMASYI & MARKS, P.C.:

Michael J. Gaffney; Daniel M. Schember.

ADDITIONAL PANEL MEMBERS

Dr. Joe Lee, Los Angeles, Nevada
William Barker, San Jose, California
John Wright, University City, Missouri
Richard Duffy, Washington, D.C.
Roger Duncan, Jacksboro, Tennessee
William Grant, Springfield, Illinois
Paul Hill, Washington, D.C.
Mary Kennedy, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania
Michael Frost, Stanford, California
Louis Monahan, Detroit, Michigan
Clarence Morris, Little Rock, Arkansas
Cynthia Peacock, Benson, North Carolina
Leonel Rosales, Brownsville, Texas
Jim Sanders, Kalamazoo, Michigan
Barbara Wylder, Spokane, Washington
Eugene Ymiolok, Tampa, Florida
Phil Zarlengo, Providence, Rhode Island

PROJECT OFFICER

Eugene Tucker (1982-83), U.S. Department of Education, Planning /
and Evaluation Service

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

In this chapter we present background information relevant to Phase III of the District Practices Study, including a discussion of our earlier research in Phases I and II and the rationale and objectives of our Phase III research. The chapter concludes with an overview of the Phase III study effort.

BACKGROUND TO PHASE III OF THE DISTRICT PRACTICES STUDY

Chapter 1 of the Education Consolidation and Improvement Act [ECIA] authorizes the largest program of federal aid to elementary and secondary schools. For school year 1982-83, Congress appropriated over \$2.5 billion for local school district (Part A) programs which served approximately 5.2 million students in over 14,000 school districts.

From 1965 to 1981 the central goal of the preceding Title I program, authorized by the Elementary and Secondary Education Act [ESEA], remained basically unchanged. Congress stated during the 1978 reauthorization of Title I, as it did in 1965 when the program was initiated, that:

The policy of the United States is to provide financial assistance to local education agencies serving areas with concentrations of children from low-income families to expand and improve their educational programs by various means which contribute particularly to meeting the special educational needs of educationally deprived children (P.L. 95-561, Section 101).

This Declaration of Policy and most other Title I provisions were modified by Chapter 1, ECIA which took effect in the 1982-83 school year.

The Chapter 1 legislation of policy maintains the national policy just cited for Title I. It adds that it is the intent of Congress to do so in a manner which will eliminate duplication, unnecessary, and contradictory paperwork and free the schools of unnecessary Federal supervision, direction, and control. (20 U.S.C. Section 8531) Although the Chapter 1 legislation made important changes in the Title I law, the intent of Congress is still that school districts use the program funds to serve eligible public and nonpublic students in elementary or secondary schools.

In 1981, the U.S. Department of Education (DOE) contracted with Assessment Technology, Inc. to conduct a national study of school district practices for operating programs under Title I. This study, "A Description of District Practices since 1978 under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965," is commonly referred to as the District Practices Study (1981).

The two principal objectives of Traces I and II of the DOE were:

- To describe how local school districts operated their Title I programs under the 1978 legal framework of ESEA as a baseline depiction for comparisons to local implementation under the provisions of Chapter 1.
- To document local educators' rationales for program decisions, their perceptions of the problems and benefits of existing Title I requirements, and their assessments of expected effects of Chapter 1 on school district implementation of Title I.

The data sources for meeting these two objectives included a mail questionnaire sent to a representative sample of over 1,000 local Title I directors and associated interviewers in 1981.

administrative practices already in operation in Chapter 1 programs across the country.

OVERVIEW OF PHASE III

Phase III of the OVS was conducted during school year 1981-82. Its chief objective was to document locally developed solutions to several types of problems faced by local school district officials in Chapter 1 programs so that descriptions of these strategies could be made available to other school districts across the country.

After consultation with federal, state, and local Chapter 1 officials, the study's Advisory Panel, and the Project Officer the study team and federal officials identified four program areas for focused investigation in Phase III. Those areas of concern were:

- The delivery of Chapter 1 services to nonpublic school students
- Inclass models for Chapter 1 programs
- The selection of students to receive Chapter 1 services using multiple criteria, including teacher ratings
- The delivery of Chapter 1 services to secondary school students

A comprehensive set of selection criteria was developed for identifying those districts visited during the Phase II data collection effort that merited further documentation of their promising administrative practices. For the purposes of this study a promising administrative practice was defined as a management strategy that appeared to offer a workable solution to

one or more of the problems commonly associated with one of the four areas of concern. To be considered a workable solution, each management strategy had to (1) be fully supported by those affected by the practice (e.g., school administrators, teachers, parents, and students); (2) have been operational for at least 12 months; and (3) conform with the legal requirements of the Chapter 1 program.

Specific problems commonly associated with each of the four areas of concern are listed in Exhibit 1. As this exhibit illustrates, the approaches documented in Phase III involve district, school, and classroom-level management issues, as well as the coordination of program services across public and private school sectors.

After a careful screening and verification process and an extensive pre-visit document review, trained two-person research teams spent up to one week on site in the selected districts. Detailed descriptions of the promising administrative practices were prepared. Approaches for enhancing nonpublic school students' participation were documented in eight districts, in seven districts with promising inclass programs, in four districts with successful secondary programs, and in three districts with systematic procedures for using multiple criteria in the selection of program participants.

In the remaining chapters of this document, we describe the procedures that we utilized in the conduct of Phase III, the findings and themes of our Phase III research, and the products that we developed as a result of that research.

EXHIBIT 1

CHAPTER 1 ADMINISTRATIVE PROBLEMS EXPLORED IN PHASE III, BY AREA OF CONCERN

Problems associated with the provision of Chapter 1 services to nonpublic students:

- How to organize the delivery of Chapter 1 services to nonpublic school students
- How to develop effective working relationships among public and nonpublic school officials

Problems associated with Chapter 1 inclass program design:

- How to develop effective classroom management strategies when an inclass design is used
- How to coordinate the regular basic skills program and the Chapter 1 program when an inclass design is used
- How to design an inclass program that is supplementary

Problems associated with the selection of students to receive Chapter 1 services:

- How to develop a systematic student selection procedure that combines a number of different measures of educational achievement, including teacher ratings, but that is not excessively burdensome to administer

Problems associated with the provision of Chapter 1 services to secondary schools students:

- How to schedule Chapter 1 services to secondary school students
- How to design a Chapter 1 program at the secondary level that complies with the supplement-not-supplant provision of the law
- How to encourage the participation of secondary students in a Chapter 1 program
- How to coordinate a secondary Chapter 1 program with a minimum competency program

CHAPTER 2

PHASE III PROCEDURES

In this chapter we set forth the procedures that were used in Phase III to examine and further document promising Chapter 1 program management strategies. We discuss how we selected districts for Phase III site visits; how we arranged and scheduled site visits; the documents that we reviewed prior to site visitation; fieldworker training and supervision; and debriefing of fieldworkers following site visits.

SELECTION OF DISTRICTS FOR PHASE III SITE VISITS

The selection of sites to be visited for further investigation and documentation of promising administrative practices involved four important steps. First, we compiled lists of candidate districts for each area of concern (i.e., delivering Chapter 1 services to nonpublic school students; implementing inclass (as opposed to pullout) Chapter 1 classes; selecting students for Chapter 1 services through the use of procedures that incorporate both test scores and teacher ratings; and providing Chapter 1 services to secondary school students). In developing the lists of candidate districts, we conducted a comprehensive review of the in-depth data collected from the 140 Title I districts visited during Phase II of the study. For each district with a practice that warranted consideration, a candidate district form was completed that provided background and demographic data on each eligible district as well as a brief

description of the promising administrative practice or practices to be further documented.

Second, it was necessary to verify that the candidate districts did indeed employ strategies of potential benefit to other districts and that those strategies were still in operation. Chapter 1 Directors in the candidate districts were contacted by telephone prior to our final selection of districts to verify that the promising practices observed in school year 1981-82 could still be documented in the 1982-83 school year. These conversations also provided an opportunity to obtain an initial reading on the willingness of the district to participate in Phase III and to determine if there were other promising administrative practices operating in the district. As a matter of protocol, no call was made to a local school district until the state Chapter 1 Coordinator had been contacted and informed that we would be contacting the local district. Information obtained during the calls to the state Coordinators also proved helpful in verifying that the candidate districts were employing strategies of potential value to other districts.

All telephone verification contacts to states and local districts were made by senior project staff to ensure that the information obtained was reliable for guiding site selection decisions. In addition, we sought verification that the practices under consideration represented workable solutions to the specified problems from a number of individuals, among them DPS Advisory Panel members, federal Chapter 1 officials, Technical

Assistance Center [TAC] personnel, and representatives from such organizations as the National Association of Administrators of Federal and State Education Programs, the National Association of Secondary School Principals, the U.S. Catholic Conference, and the Council of American Private Education.

The third step involved purposively selecting from the candidate lists those districts that were invited to participate in the study. The following considerations guided the final selection:

- Diversity of school district types (urban, suburban, rural), sizes, and geographic locations.
- Likelihood that the practices being documented could be transferred or adapted to other school districts.
- To maximize the number of practices that could be documented within the budgetary constraints of the study, special consideration was given to districts with more than one promising administrative practice.

Finally, we briefed the Project Officer and ED officials on the practices to be documented and the characteristics of the districts to be visited. Following this review, we invited selected districts to participate in the study according to the procedures described in the following section.

PROCEDURES FOR INVITING PARTICIPATION AND ARRANGING SITE VISITS

In the initial telephone calls to the Chapter 1 Directors in candidate districts, we were able to ascertain the willingness of those Directors and their districts to participate in Phase III. When the final site selection decisions were made, we sent letters of notification to the district Chapter 1 Director, the district Superintendent, and the state Chapter 1 Coordinator.

The letter to the Chapter 1 Director informed the Director that his/her district had been selected for inclusion in the study and noted the aspect(s) of the Chapter 1 program that we were interested in investigating. We requested his/her continued cooperation and thanked the Director for agreeing to participate in Phase III of the study. The letter also stated the proposed dates of our visit, subject to district approval, and included a list of any background documents that were needed for site visit preparation. For further information on the types of documents that were requested, see Exhibit 2. Prior to the site visit, we telephoned the Chapter 1 Director to establish a schedule of interviews and observations, and to confirm the logistical details of our visit.

Our correspondence with the district Superintendent following selection of the districts for site visitation resembled the letter to the Chapter 1 Director in substance, but did not elaborate the logistical details of our visit. The letter notified the superintendent of the selection of his/her district for visitation and cited the promising administrative practice(s) that we intended to document. We solicited his/her continued cooperation and support of the District Practices Study.

Prior to our first contact with candidate school districts, telephone calls were made to each state Chapter 1 Coordinator to inform him/her of our preliminary selection of a district(s) in that state for inclusion in the study. Following final site selection, we sent letters to the state Coordinators to notify

EXHIBIT 2

DOCUMENTS REQUESTED FROM PHASE III SITE VISIT DISTRICTS

General Documents

- Brochures prepared by the district that describe the district program or the Chapter 1 program in that district
- Title I/Chapter 1 application and any amendments to application
- Organizational charts showing location of Chapter 1 program in district structure

Nonpublic

- Job description of nonpublic coordinator, if there is one
- State-issued guidelines for serving nonpublic students
- Any federal and state monitoring reports and audit reports that discuss nonpublic service delivery
- Sample memoranda and letters regarding nonpublic participation (particularly to nonpublic principals)
- Administrative forms and documents related to nonpublic participation
- Summaries or excerpts from state laws relevant to serving students in nonpublic schools with public funds

Student Selection

- Written student selection policy statement (if one exists other than what is in the application)
- Selection forms used by the district
- District memoranda related to student selection (particularly to Principals)
- SEA-issued guidelines on student selection
- Federal and state monitoring and auditing reports that discuss student selection

EXHIBIT 2 (cont.)

Inclass

- Written program descriptions
- Title I/Chapter 1 memoranda pertaining to inclass design
- SEA-issued guidelines on (a) designing and managing inclass programs, (b) program design, and (c) supplement-not-supplant and excess costs
- Federal and state monitoring and audit reports that discuss program design
- Title I/Chapter 1 evaluations
- Any other documents that discuss program design

Secondary

- Written program descriptions
- Title I/Chapter 1 memoranda pertaining to the secondary program
- SEA-issued guidelines on designing secondary programs or minimum competency testing/mandated remedial services (if applicable) and Chapter 1
- Federal and state monitoring and audit reports that discuss secondary or minimum competency testing/mandated remedial services and Chapter 1 (if applicable)
- Descriptions of minimum competency testing programs (if applicable)

them of the district(s) in their states that had been selected and the proposed dates of those visits. In all correspondence to state and local district officials, a senior staff member was designated as a contact. Officials were encouraged to contact this staff member with their questions and concerns.

Several weeks before our visit to the district, we again contacted the Chapter 1 Director to establish a schedule of interviews and observations, and to confirm the details of our visit. We summarized the details discussed during the phone conversation in a brief memorandum that was sent to the Chapter 1 Director to aid in his/her preparation for our visit..

FIELDWORKER TRAINING

After field testing of the interview protocols by senior staff members in a nearby school district, detailed training of the interview teams took place. During the training sessions, fieldworkers were presented with background information on the specific areas of Chapter 1 administration to be investigated and on the literature related to documentation of exemplary practices. The staff was also provided with intensive training and practice in the use of the site visit fieldworker guide and in the drafting of the site visit write-ups.

Pre-Training Briefing

Obtaining the most complete and useful information from site visits required that the fieldworkers be thoroughly informed about each Chapter 1 program they would visit. Background information was derived from the data collected during our Phase II

visit to the district and from documents that we requested in the letter of notification to the district Chapter 1 Director.

Exhibit 2 lists the types of documents that were reviewed from each district.

As soon as site visit arrangements were made, each fieldworker was given a documentation package consisting of all background information on the district and the Fieldworker Guide for site visits. Team members were instructed to become thoroughly familiar with this information prior to the training sessions. In addition, they were also asked to note the types of information about the district that were still needed and to consider how they planned to obtain that information during the site visits. These notes formed the basis for the small group sessions on individual districts described below.

Fieldworker Training

The two-day training session consisted of the following modules:

- Overview of Phase III objectives. This session began with a summary of the background and purposes of Phase III, led by the Project Director and Deputy Project Director.
- Briefing on the four aspects of Chapter 1 administration that were documented in Phase III. Fieldworkers received information about the legal and administrative issues associated with providing Chapter 1 services to nonpublic school students, designing a Chapter 1 inclass program, selecting students for Chapter 1 services, and delivering Chapter 1 services to secondary students. ED officials participated in these briefings, providing fieldworkers with a clear understanding of the issues that were of greatest importance in each of the four areas.

- Review of exemplary site literature. A senior analyst on the study staff summarized for the fieldworkers the lessons that other investigators of "exemplary practices" have learned from their efforts.
- Training in the use of the Fieldworker Guide. Intensive training and practice in the use of the Fieldworker Guide was necessary to ensure the successful completion of site visits. Senior members of the project staff conducted the training under the leadership of the Manager for Site Documentation. Members of the Fieldworker Guide development team and the field test interview team also played a significant role in the training.
- Review of the format for the site visit write-ups. To ensure that descriptions of promising practices were similar in format, fieldworkers were provided with sample write-ups derived from the field test. These sample write-ups were reviewed and discussed during this segment of the training session.
- Discussion of the field test experience. The team responsible for the field test reviewed their experiences in conducting the interviews, assimilating the information, and preparing the write-ups. This review allowed the fieldworkers to anticipate some of the problems they might face in the field.
- Small group sessions on individual districts. During this phase of the training, the staff was divided into small groups to discuss what was already known about the district to be visited. The questions that the fieldworkers identified during the pre-training briefing were addressed at this time. In addition, the staff members that made the telephone calls to the districts reviewed their notes on the conversation with the fieldworkers assigned to that district and discussed with them unique aspects that might affect the visit to the district.
- Review of logistical details of the visit. The training session concluded with a discussion of logistical and administrative details of the site visits.

SITE VISIT PLANS

In planning the Phase III site visits, we sought to develop an approach that would provide a comprehensive, timely, and cost-effective investigation of the four problem areas, yet one that

and did not unnecessarily overburden the staff of any individual school district.

Staffing

Five highly experienced two-person research teams were assembled to conduct the field investigations. Each team had as its leader a senior analyst, experienced as an interviewer and familiar with all aspects of the local administration of Chapter 1, ESEA programs. The five team leaders were Dr. Richard Long, Dr. Anne Hastings, Dr. Richard Aplana, Mr. Michael Gaffney, and Mr. Daniel Schenker. Each team was also staffed with an experienced fieldworker who had participated in the Phase II data collection efforts.

The Schedule of Visits

The field test and fieldworker training were held during the week of January 17, 1983. The site visits took place between January 24 and March 2, 1983.

Each research team was in the field for a period of two weeks. Site visits varied in duration from three to five days depending upon factors such as the number of effective strategies to be documented in the district (as many as four separate strategies were investigated in some districts) and the size of the district (longer site visits were sometimes scheduled in large school districts to allow extra time for interviewing larger staffs and traveling within metropolitan areas). When feasible, research teams were scheduled to visit districts located within the same geographic areas. Such planning reduced both travel time and costs.

Fieldworker Supervision

During all phases of Phase III, project staff bore the ultimate responsibility for staff supervision related with the Project Director, Dr. Richard Long. He was supported in this role by the Deputy Project Director, Dr. Jane Hastings. He assumed day-to-day responsibility for staff supervision. Dr. Hastings directly oversaw the fieldworkers during site visit preparation and training, throughout on-site data collection, and during subsequent documentation of promising administrative practices. Fieldworkers were expected to make weekly phone contact with Dr. Long or Dr. Hastings during site visits; they were encouraged to telephone more frequently as questions or concerns arose. Given the small number of fieldworkers and the integrated and experienced nature of the staff, it was possible to maintain a direct and constant supervisory relationship between project managers and project staff.

Debriefing

Following each trip cycle, all fieldworkers participated in a full-day debriefing session. Some of the topics discussed were unexpected aspects of administrative practices encountered; difficulties experienced in interviewing administrators, observing program activities, or reviewing documents; and any other experiences that the fieldworkers found notable. The sessions also served to prepare the fieldworkers for the documentation of promising administrative practices. These site visit write-ups, the final products of Phase III, are discussed in detail in Chapter 4.

CHAPTER 3

PHASE III: FINDINGS AND THEMES

I think one of the greatest untold stories is what we've done with Title I, now Chapter 1. . . . There are some very outstanding creative programs available, and we need to do all that we can to help our leaders in the Chapter 1 programs utilize the most successful programs in touching these children (Terrel H. Bell, quoted in Education Daily, October 20, 1982).

INTRODUCTION

In recent years, an identifiable "effective school" literature has materialized with a core set of major findings or themes (Benbow, 1980; Bickel, 1982; Brookover, 1979; Clark, Lotto, & McCarthy, 1980; Cohen, 1982; Edmonds, 1979 & 1982; Frederickson, 1975; MacKenzie, 1982; Madaus, Airasian, & Kellaghan, 1980; Odden & Dougherty, 1982; Purkey & Smith, 1983; Weber, 1971). While lists of pedagogical and administrative prescriptions vary to some degree across these studies, at least five features of effective programs or schools have surfaced, in one form or another, from these analyses: (1) strong administrative support and instructional leadership, (2) a school climate conducive to learning, (3) expectations which challenge students, teachers, and administrators, (4) tailored instructional approaches which emphasize basic skills, and (5) regular student and program evaluation (Bickel, 1983, pp. 3-5).

As discussed in the previous chapter, the major objective of Phase III of this study was to document workable solutions for

key administrative issues in the local operation of Chapter 1, ECIA programs. These administrative issues include (1) the delivery of services to nonpublic school students; (2) the implementation of inclass models; (3) the use of multiple criteria, including teacher rating scales for selecting program participants; and (4) the implementation and operation of secondary Chapter 1 programs.

To provide an interpretative context for the major themes surfacing from the sites visited in Phase III, this chapter first summarizes findings from Phases I and II which pertain to local school officials' needs and requests for information to improve the local operation of the Chapter 1 programs. Next, the legal requirements for each area of investigation during Phase III are discussed as well as the major findings from Phase II for each area. Finally, important themes surfacing from a cross-case analysis of the site visit descriptions are presented in the context of the program's legal requirements, Phase II findings, and broader educational trends.

INFORMATION NEEDS OF LOCAL CHAPTER 1 OFFICIALS IN A TIME OF TRANSITION

Visits to districts during Phase II of this study revealed that local program officials want and need more information about the extent of their flexibility in decision making under Chapter 1 (Turnbull, 1982, p. 24). Time and again during these visits, district officials expressed a strong desire to receive information, especially examples of alternative approaches for complying with statutory requirements and guidelines.

Officials in many of the districts visited were also unaware of options for changing or improving their compensatory education programs, which had been available to them for years under the Title I legal framework (Turnbull, 1982, pp. 27-28). Given the increased flexibility of the Chapter 1 legal framework, disseminating information about alternative approaches to address key administrative issues is likely not only to improve compliance, but also to serve as a means of helping local decision makers recognize and use the flexibility accorded them under the Chapter 1 requirements.

More than one quarter of the local Title I Directors interviewed during Phase II wanted to change at least one major aspect of their program such as grade levels served, the use of an inclass or pullout design, the introduction of a new instructional technology, or other curricular changes. The most frequently cited reasons for not making such changes were uncertainties both about the legality of the change and the state's view of untried approaches (Advanced Technology, 1983, chap. 5).

Thus, while the exact information needs of districts may shift with increased knowledge and experience in operating under the the Chapter 1 program requirements, Title I's history strongly suggests that information dissemination about alternative local administrative approaches is likely to foster the local flexibility intended by the streamlined Chapter 1 legal groundrules.

THE LEGAL REQUIREMENTS AND PHASE II FINDINGS SUMMARIZED FOR
ADMINISTRATIVE AREAS DOCUMENTED IN PHASE III

Chapter 1 Services to Nonpublic School Students

Congress included several new provisions in the 1978 Title I law in an attempt to remedy the possibility that nonpublic school students were not receiving their fair share of program services. Essentially identical provisions were incorporated into the Chapter 1, ECIA legislation. According to both laws, educationally deprived children residing in a Title I/Chapter 1 project area and attending a nonpublic school should have the same opportunity to receive federally funded compensatory education services as their public school counterparts, even if the school they attend is outside the project area. Both laws also stipulate that program expenditures for public and nonpublic students should be comparable within a district.

Despite the congressional intent in the 1978 Title I legislation (maintained in the Chapter 1 law) to make nonpublic school student participation in the Title I program more comparable with that of public school students, the overall participation level of nonpublic students has, at best, been at a steady state since 1976. In fact, several indicators point to a relative marginal decline of nonpublic students' participation in the program. For example, the participation rate for nonpublic school students in Title I increased by less than 6 percent between 1976 and 1980, while public school student's participation increased by almost 18 percent during that period. ("Participation rate" is defined as the percent of total elementary and secondary enrollment,

nonpublic and public respectively, participating in the Title I program.) Also, the proportion of Title I districts serving nonpublic students residing in Title I attendance areas declined from 59 percent to 56 percent between 1976 and 1981 (Advanced Technology, 1983, pp. 9-11 to 9-15).

Data from Phase II of the study were not sufficient to explain fully why some eligible nonpublic students were not receiving Title I services. Certainly, in some states, legal restrictions prohibiting public aid to secretarian schools impeded nonpublic students' access to the program (Jung, 1982, p. 24). Some nonpublic school officials decline Title I/Chapter 1 services for students attending their schools for a number of reasons ranging from practical considerations (e.g., too much paperwork and scheduling complications) to philosophical and legal rationales (e.g., separation of church and state issues; state Attorney General rulings) (Advanced Technology, 1983, pp. 9-20 to 9-21).

The Phase III descriptions portray a number of approaches for addressing some of the more frequently cited problems associated with the provision of services to nonpublic students. Such problems include:

- How to develop effective working relationships among public and nonpublic school officials
- How to involve nonpublic school officials in the design of Chapter 1 programs
- How to design services for nonpublic school students that are comparable to those provided to public school students, but that meet any differential needs participating nonpublic school students might have

- How to serve eligible nonpublic school students attending schools outside a Chapter 1 district
- How to serve eligible children who attend the same nonpublic school, but reside in several different public school districts
- How to serve nonpublic eligible school students when there are only a small number of nonpublic students
- How to deliver services to nonpublic school students in states with legal restrictions prohibiting aid to sectarian schools
- How to determine eligibility and select nonpublic school students for participation in Chapter 1 programs in districts undergoing desegregation

Sites that offered a variety of approaches to accommodate the diverse state and local contexts in which these students are served were selected for further documentation of their promising administrative practices for improving nonpublic school student participation in the Chapter 1 program.

Inclass Models

Even though the Title I law never required the use of a pullout approach to demonstrate compliance with the program's funds allocation provisions, Congress, in passing Chapter 1, felt it necessary to reemphasize that "a local education agency shall not be required to provide services under this chapter [Chapter 1] outside the regular classroom or school program" (§ 558(c) of ECIA).

Both the preponderance of districts using a pullout model for all or part of their Title I program--92 percent in the 1981-82 school year (Advanced Technology, 1983, p. 5-33), and Phase II case study data which found widespread misconceptions at the local level concerning the program's supplement-not-supplant

provisions suggest that such a statutory statement was necessary (Gaffney & Schember, 1982a, pp. 26-30). Even though about 30 percent of the districts were using an inclass approach by the 1981-82 school year, one of the most important reasons districts cited for not moving to a greater emphasis on an inclass design was that they were uncertain whether their program would still be in compliance if such a change were made (Advanced Technology, 1983, p. 5-40).

Despite its prevalence as a method for providing categorical services to special need students, the pullout model has come under increasing criticism. Critics allege that the pullout approach (1) makes program coordination more difficult; (2) fragments the delivery of instructional services; (3) causes disruption because of increased student movement; (4) reduces time on task; (5) creates scheduling problems; and (6) stigmatizes children who are pulled out to receive remedial services. Nonetheless, over two-thirds of the districts employing a pullout approach for Chapter 1 believed the approach to be educationally superior for their particular needs (Advanced Technology, 1983, pp. 5-33 to 5-35).

Some districts are reassessing their use of the pullout model in response to such criticisms and are becoming interested in inclass models as an alternative to the pullout approach. Districts that have moved away from the pullout model and have turned to inclass approaches have found that, even with an inclass model, they must focus on issues concerning program coordination, classroom management, and the provision of supplemental

services to Chapter 1 participants. These were the issues investigated in the Phase III districts implementing inclass or replacement model projects.

Services to Secondary Students

In the 1981-82 school year, 1 in 5 students served by Title I was in grade 7 or above, and fewer than 5 percent were in the senior high grades 10, 11 or 12. Fewer than 18 percent of the Title I districts provided program services to students in these 3 grades (Advanced Technology, 1983, pp. 5-6 to 5-8). While limited funding was most often cited as the primary reason for not serving students in the program above grade 6, a substantial portion of districts offering secondary-level programs (54 percent) experienced some scheduling problems when implementing Title I programs at the secondary level. Problems also exist in some districts because of perceived or real complications in designing programs that comply with the supplement-not-supplant provisions of the law, because of some secondary students' reluctance to participate due to possible stigmatization, and because of complications in coordinating Title I programs with state or local minimum competency programs (Advanced Technology, 1983, pp. 5-13, 5-15 to 5-17).

We specifically selected some Phase III districts in order to obtain descriptions of various approaches used by districts to serve secondary students which address these problems.

Systematizing Teacher Judgment In Selecting Program Participants
Through the Use of Teacher Rating Scales

Even prior to Chapter 1's increased flexibility for developing criteria and procedures for selecting program participants, teachers generally had more say in actual student selection decisions than district officials recognized. In nearly 60 percent of the Title I districts, teachers decided in certain circumstances to serve some students who scored above the district's established cutoff score and in other instances decided to exclude some eligible students below the district's cutoff score if the students were deemed to either not need or not be able to benefit from the services (Gaffney & Schember, 1982b, p. 23).

Under Chapter 1, districts have more flexibility in assessing the eligibility and needs of students served in the program. While Chapter 1 maintains the Title I requirement that a participating district must conduct an annual educational needs assessment, the new law only permits, not requires, the selection of educationally deprived children in the greatest need of special assistance. Nonetheless, a systematic process to determine need and select students is necessary to achieve the targeting goal of the program in a fair and equitable manner.

Since Phase II findings reveal that a large proportion of local Title I administrators and teachers desired increased use of teacher judgment and less exclusive reliance on test scores for making student selection decisions (Advanced Technology, 1983, pp. 4-14 to 4-15), in Phase III we selected a number of

districts which were believed to have in place a systematic set of procedures for selecting students. Each of these districts' approach to student selection combined a number of different indicators for measuring educational achievement including teacher rating scales which were generally deemed by those using the procedures as not being excessively burdensome to complete or administer.

PHASE III: MAJOR FINDINGS AND THEMES

Even though the focus of Phase III was on identifying and documenting districts with effective administrative approaches for local Chapter 1 programs, many features of effective instructional approaches cited in the broader-scoped effective school literature (discussed earlier) were commonly found operating in the Chapter 1 programs. Strong administrative support is a key all of the effective strategies documented, particularly in the development of comparable programs for eligible students in nonpublic schools. Viable in-class and secondary programs featured strong student and program evaluation components. The various secondary approaches documented, among them a school within a school model, a learning lab within a school, and a separate continuing education center, had appeared, through the energies of a core staff, learning environments that students evidently found both challenging and beneficial. After the adoption of a new in-class or replacement model Chapter 1 program was motivated by a strong desire to fashion physical as

well as organizational arrangements which provided intensive and sustained program services.

The Phase III fieldwork also supports other generalizations that have become virtual truisms of organizational reform research. First, there are no panaceas. Each approach documented has as many unresolved issues as it does procedures and experiences which may benefit other districts. The highly tailored approaches documented were often designed, implemented, and defended by a single energetic and persistent individual. Transferring these approaches to other schools may require considerable adaptation and a similarly committed advocate for the approach to take root.

Second, regardless of the nature or scope of the approaches, their development was almost always at least partially motivated by conditions or questions that were part of the larger local implementation context. They eventually were accepted or endorsed by a number of school and community members. The reform had to be consistent with the district's capacities and organizational structure. For these and a number of other reasons, those wishing to adopt or adapt a documented approach, in whole or in part, should approach the introduction of such a change in a gradual and collaborative fashion. Also, those implementing these approaches will likely find that refinements and accommodations will continue even after the reform has been accepted and institutionalized.

Approaches to Chapter 1 Services for Nonpublic School Students

Although a number of techniques for developing more effective working relationships among public and nonpublic school officials were documented, at the core there was always one or two individuals who were the primary force behind the development and/or maintenance of a trusting and cooperative relationship between the two sectors. The primary basis for this cooperative relationship was usually a firm conviction by active nonpublic officials that a high level of service was provided to nonpublic students within the legal obligations and constraints of the program.

Given the diversity of settings and circumstances in which nonpublic students are served in the Chapter 1 program, no single set of management practices can be universally deemed effective. Certain strategies under certain conditions, however, do appear to enhance nonpublic school participation and the level of services they receive. Below are outlined a few of these management strategies documented in Phase III sites.

- The role of the nonpublic liaison is frequently institutionalized in a district-level staff position. Variouslly referred to as the nonpublic liaison, coordinator, or representative, this person facilitates communication between nonpublic and district personnel and strives to ensure effective delivery of Title I services to nonpublic schools and students. The responsibilities of the liaison/coordinator are varied, depending upon the needs of the district and the scope of the liaison role. Responsibilities often include supervision of nonpublic Chapter 1 staff, student evaluation and selection, program design, information dissemination and training, and coordination between district and nonpublic personnel. Districts using a nonpublic liaison/coordinator frequently report improved delivery of nonpublic services because of this institutionalized role.

- Some of the strategies for involving nonpublic officials in the design of Chapter 1 programs include (1) inviting nonpublic Principals to yearly budget meetings and informing them of evaluation results; (2) surveying by phone or questionnaire nonpublic Principals and teachers to elicit suggestions and complaints; (3) briefing nonpublic officials on legislative changes; (4) ensuring that nonpublic students' parents are represented on PACs and communicating the activities undertaken at these meetings to nonpublic school officials.

Chapter 1 Inclass Models

We present here a partial list of approaches, documented during Phase III, which have been developed by some districts as alternatives to the traditional pullout design.

- Whole Class Lab Model: Chapter 1 and non-Chapter 1 children, accompanied by their regular teacher, move to a remedial lab. In this specially equipped room within the school building, services are provided to Chapter 1 children by Chapter 1 and regular staff. Both Chapter 1 and non-Chapter 1 students receive instruction from the regular classroom teacher, but Chapter 1 children also receive intensive service through use of the special equipment in the room and an individualized teaching approach. Regular teacher involvement is the key to the success of this model.
- Chapter 1 Teacher and/or Paraprofessional in the Regular Classroom: Chapter 1 teachers and/or paraprofessionals are assigned to the regular classroom, working in cooperation with the regular classroom teacher to provide intensive instruction to the Chapter 1 students in the classroom. The Chapter 1 staff member may work with Chapter 1 students at their desks, in small groups within the classroom, or a combination of these approaches. The Chapter 1 students receive direct instruction from the regular classroom teacher, that is then reinforced by the Chapter 1 teacher/paraprofessional during times when those students are not receiving direct instruction (i.e., seatwork time or while another group is receiving direct instruction from the regular classroom teacher). The Chapter 1 staff use special materials and equipment to reinforce instruction introduced in the regular classroom.

- Traveling Lab or Itinerant Chapter 1 Teacher: With this approach, Chapter 1 and non-Chapter 1 children are visited by Chapter 1 teachers and paraprofessionals in the regular classroom. The Chapter 1 staff may bring with them a lab cart that is equipped with special teaching materials for use with Chapter 1 students. Small group or individual work with non-Chapter 1 children must be performed by regular staff while Chapter 1 and regular staff provide intensive services to Chapter 1 students. The regular teacher must, therefore, be present and active with both Chapter 1 and non-Chapter 1 students during these sessions.

Approaches to Chapter 1 Services for Secondary School Students

Models for serving secondary students varied according to funding level, state minimum competency requirements, space availability, and the educational priorities of Chapter 1 officials. Below are thumbnail descriptions of a few of the approaches documented in Phase III.

- A Reading Lab: Staffed by a full-time reading specialist and a part-time instructional aide, students come to this lab in lieu of study hall for two to five periods a week to receive supplemental help beyond that provided by state and local sources to learn reading skills in small groups or through individualized instruction.
- A Continuing Education Center: Established in a separate building as an alternative environment for high school dropouts or potential dropouts, participation in this Chapter 1-funded center is self-selected by students in consultation with school counselors and welfare agency officials. After a rigorous selection procedure, students are cycled into the center for periods ranging from several weeks to several months. In the center, students work with the teaching staff in small groups, receiving intensive, specialized instruction and skill reinforcement. The school district contributes to the center by providing the facility and some staff who augment the Chapter 1 staff by performing either teaching or counseling functions. Following their stay in the center, students return to the regular classroom where they can continue to receive Chapter 1 remediation on an as-needed basis.

- An Itinerant Inclass Aide: This aide provides Chapter 1 students reading-in-the-content-area special assistance which is coordinated with the curriculum of the regular classroom teacher once or twice a week within the regular classroom.
- The Team Teaching Approach: The team teaching approach is essentially a replacement model. A normal size social studies class (30 students), all eligible Chapter 1 program participants, is assigned two teachers. One is a social studies teacher paid by nonfederal funds, and the other is a Chapter 1 reading teacher. The classroom is divided by a wall or other divider, with access to either half through a door or opening. While the regular teacher provides social studies instruction to half of the class in one part of the divided room, the Chapter 1 teacher provides reading and language arts instruction to the other half of the class. The Chapter 1 teacher, however, uses the social studies text to prepare, for example, vocabulary drills using words from the text. After one week, the teachers switch groups.

Systematizing Teacher Judgment In Selecting Program Participants

A number of approaches for quantifying teacher judgments into teacher rating scales and for systematically incorporating these ratings with other measures of student academic achievement levels are documented. Each approach features:

- Procedures for keeping the process as simple to implement for teachers and administrators as possible
- Strategies for providing training, technical assistance, and clear, concise instructions to Principals and teachers
- Systematic methods for making exceptions
- Procedures and forms for encouraging inter-rater reliability
- Systems for providing feedback to Principals and teachers on the results of a composite score selection procedure

The manner in which we documented the promising administrative approaches and the reports that we produced in Phase III are discussed in the next chapter.

CHAPTER 4

PHASE III PRODUCTS

In this chapter, we present the kinds and numbers of promising administrative practices that were documented in Phase III. We also discuss the manner in which we described and documented those approaches.

PROMISING ADMINISTRATIVE PRACTICES DOCUMENTED IN PHASE III

Exhibit 3 presents a listing of the descriptions of effective program management strategies developed during Phase III by district and by area of concern. We have disguised the identities of the districts in keeping with our assurance of confidentiality to site visit districts.

Promising administrative practices were documented by Phase III field researchers in 14 local school districts. A total of 22 separate strategies were documented since several districts had more than one effective management practice in operation. Effective strategies for providing Chapter 1 services to non-public students were found in eight districts; four models for serving secondary school students were documented. Student selection procedures that incorporate teacher judgement ratings were documented in three Chapter 1 programs, and seven districts' solutions to administrative problems commonly associated with the implementation of an inclass program are described.

EXHIBIT 3

PROMISING ADMINISTRATIVE PRACTICES DOCUMENTED IN PHASE III, BY DISTRICT AND AREA OF CONCERN

<u>DISTRICT</u>	<u>AREA OF CONCERN</u>			
	<u>NONPUBLIC</u>	<u>INCLASS</u>	<u>STUDENT SELECTION</u>	<u>SECONDARY</u>
A	•	•		
B	•			•
C				•
D		•		
E	•	•		
F				•
G		•	•	
H			•	
I	•			
J	•	•		
K		•		
L	•	•	•	•
M	•			
N	•			

DESCRIPTIONS OF PROMISING ADMINISTRATIVE PRACTICES

Following in-depth site visits to the school districts that developed and implemented the effective program management strategies, the site visit teams prepared detailed descriptions of each strategy. Each description begins with the relevant problem statement followed by a full explication of the promising administrative practice. The descriptions are assembled in four separate volumes; each volume contains the complete documentation pertaining to a particular area of concern (i.e., nonpublic, inclass, student selection, or secondary). In this format, the descriptions can be reviewed either as a complete report covering the full range of promising administrative practices documented in Phase III, or as a separate volume presenting, for example, eight effective strategies for implementing or enhancing Chapter 1 services to nonpublic school students.

The descriptions are written in clear, nontechnical language so that the information can be readily used by other school districts. Further, the descriptions are designed to provide all the information a Chapter 1 administrator would need to assess the applicability of a promising practice to a particular situation and implement the strategy in his/her district.

In addition to explaining the solution itself in detail, the descriptions also refer the reader to a characterization of the district (presented in an appendix to each volume) that provides demographic and other salient information about the district and its Chapter 1 program. The purpose of such a

characterization is to give the reader and prospective implementer a true sense of the context in which the strategy was developed.

Other common elements of the descriptions are 1) an historic overview that discusses factors contributing to development of the effective strategy; 2) a description of the development process including milestones, impediments, and refinements to the strategy; 3) a "how to" of the strategy that details the information needed to replicate the strategy; and 4) a discussion of critical elements (i.e., those factors that appear to be most important for successful implementation).

REFERENCES

- Advanced Technology, Inc. (1983). Local operation of Title I, ESEA 1976-1982: A resource book. McLean, VA: Author.
- Bell tells Chapter 1 administrators to find their best projects. (1982, October 20). Education Daily, p. 3.
- Bell, T.H. (1982, October 19). The goals and performance priorities of the U.S Department of Education for fiscal year 1983 (mimeo). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education.
- Benbow, C. (1980). Review of instructionally effective schooling literature. ERIC Clearinghouse on Urban Education, Teachers College, Columbia University.
- Bickel, W.E. (1983, April). Effective schools: Knowledge, dissemination, inquiry. Educational Researcher, 12(4), 3-5.
- Bickel, W.E. (1982, October). Expanding the role of evaluation research in school districts: The documentation of a school improvement program. Paper presented at the Joint Meeting of Evaluation Network and Evaluation Research Society, Baltimore, MD.
- Brookover, W.B., & Legotte, L.W. (1979). Changes in school characteristics coincident with changes in student achievement. East Lansing, MI: Institute for Research on Teaching, Michigan University.
- Clark, D.L., Lotto, L.S., & McCarthy, M.M. (1980). Secondary source study of exceptionality in urban elementary schools. In Phi Delta Kappa, Why do some urban schools succeed? The Phi Delta Kappa study of exceptional urban elementary schools. Bloomington, IN: Phi Delta Kappa and Indiana University.
- Cohen, M. (1982, January-February). Effective schools, accumulating research findings. American Education, 13-16.
- Edmonds, R.R. (1979). Some schools work and more can. Social Policy, 9, 28-32.
- Edmonds, R.R. (1982). Programs of school improvement: An overview. Educational Leadership, 40(3), 4-11.
- Frederickson, J.R. (1975). School effectiveness and equality of educational opportunity. New York: Carnegie Corporation.

- Gaffney, M.J., & Schember, D.M. (1982a). The effects of the Title I supplement-not-supplant and excess costs provisions on program design decisions. McLean, VA: Advanced Technology, Inc.
- Gaffney, M.J., & Schember, D.M. (1982b). Current Title I school and student selection procedures and implications for implementing Chapter 1, ECIA. McLean, VA: Advanced Technology, Inc.
- Jung, R. (1982). Nonpublic school students in Title I ESEA programs: A question of "equal" services. McLean, VA: Advanced Technology, Inc.
- MacKenzie, D.E. (1982, June). Resources for leadership: A structured bibliography of school effectiveness literature. Unpublished manuscript, Marquette University.
- Madala, G.F., Afrasian, P.W., & Kellaghan, T. (1980). School effectiveness: A reassessment of the evidence. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company.
- Odden, A., & Dougherty, V. (1982). State programs of school improvement: A 50-state survey. Denver, CO: Education Commission of the States.
- Purkey, S.C., & Smith, M.S. (1982). Effective schools--A review. Elementary School Journal, 83(4), 437-452.
- Turnbull, B.J. (1982). Technical assistance and local program implementation in Title I ESEA. McLean, VA: Advanced Technology, Inc.
- Weber, G. (1971). Inner-city children can be taught to read: Four successful schools. Washington, DC: Council for Basic Education.